

Serial No.: 10/769,768
Docket No.: 101-1013
Amendment dated May 20, 2009
Reply to the Office Action of March 3, 2009

REMARKS

Introduction

This Amendment is filed in response to the Office Action mailed on March 3, 2009 and the Examiner's Interview Summary mailed on March 6, 2009.

Upon entry of the foregoing Amendment, claims 1-16 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 6, and 15 have been amended in an earnest effort to address the Examiner's concerns regarding clarity of these claims. No new matter is being presented.

In view of the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-16 are respectfully requested.

Interview Summary

During a telephone interview initiated by Examiner Elahee on March 3, 2009, the Examiner indicated that by making the following non-substantive clarifications to claims 1, 6, and 15, the Examiner would allow all of the pending claims:

- (1) incorporating "via the main terminal" after "telephone network" in line 5 of claim 1 and line 9 of claim 6;
- (2) changing "external terminal" to "main terminal" in line 11 of claim 1 and line 15 of claim 6; and
- (3) incorporate "via the main terminal, in response to a request that the telephone network be disconnected from the external terminal and instead be connected to the main terminal" after "telephone network" in line 5 of claim 15, to change "internal signal" to "internal current" in lines 4 and 6 of claim 15, and to incorporate "the external terminal is connected to the telephone network, after" after "when" in line 6 of claim 15.

However, contrary to the implication of the Examiner's Interview Summary mailed on March 6, 2009, Applicant did not "agree" to amend the claims "to overcome the prior art rejection," but instead merely agreed to take the Examiner's proposed claim amendments under further consideration for clarification purposes, and to help expedite prosecution of the instant application.

Therefore, since the proposed claim amendments were offered as non-substantive and

Serial No.: 10/769,768
Docket No.: 101-1013
Amendment dated May 20, 2009
Reply to the Office Action of March 3, 2009

for clarification purposes only, the claim amendments do not raise any *Festo*-type estoppels.

Claims 1-16

While Applicant submits that the prior art of record fails to teach or suggest all of the features of the invention as previously recited in claims 1-16 (for at least the reasons pointed out in Applicant's previous response filed on December 18, 2008, the Remarks of which are incorporated herein by reference), Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 6 in the manner suggested by the Examiner during the telephone interview initiated by the Examiner on March 3, 2009, and has amended claim 15 substantially in the manner suggested by the Examiner, with a minor variation to maintain clarity of the claim language.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 6, and 15 are allowable over the prior art of record, and withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of independent claims 1, 6, and 15 are respectfully requested.

With regard to dependent claims 2-5, 7-14, and 16, it is respectfully submitted that for at least the reason that these claims depend from one of independent claims 1, 6, and 15, which are allowable over the prior art of record for at least the reasons pointed out above, dependent claims 2-5, 7-14, and 16 are also allowable over the prior art of record, and allowance of these claims are respectfully requested.

Applicant notes that the above-identified amendments are made without addressing further the merits of the cited prior art, and without addressing the Examiner's remarks in the Office Action mailed on March 3, 2009, in an earnest effort to forward prosecution of the subject patent application toward a favorable conclusion given the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-16 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art of record, and withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 1-16 are respectfully requested.

Serial No.: 10/769,768
Docket No.: 101-1013
Amendment dated May 20, 2009
Reply to the Office Action of March 3, 2009

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, there being no other objections or rejections, this application is in condition for allowance, and a notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

If any further fees are required in connection with the filing of this amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 502827.

Respectfully submitted,

STANZIONE & KIM, LLP

Dated: May 20, 2009
919 18th St., NW, Suite 440
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: (202) 775-1900
Facsimile: (202) 775-1901

By: Andrew Lake
Andrew Lake
Registration No. 53,909